Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 27 1964
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1963.

No. 564.

CARMEN TISONE,

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF OHIO,

Appellee.

MOTION AND BRIEF TO DISMISS APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

CLYDE W. OSBORNE,
Prosecuting Attorney,
Mahoning County Court House,
Market Street,
Youngstown, Ohio,

LOREN E. VAN BROCKLIN,
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney,
Mahoning County Court House,
Market Street,
Youngstown, Ohio,
Attorneys for Appellee.

THEODORE R. SAKER,
50 E. Broad Street,
Columbus, Ohio,

AVETIS G. DARVANAN,
802 Mahoning Bank Building,
Youngstown, Ohio,
Attorneys for Appellant.

THE GILBERT LEGAL PUBLISHING CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO—PHONE: 621-5647

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Question Presented 1

Statutes Involved 1

Statement 2

Argument 3

Conclusion 9

Appendices:

A. Opinion of the Court of Appeals of Mahoning County, Ohio 10

Journal Entry of the Court of Appeals 13

Journal Entry of the Court of Appeals Overruling Motion for Rehearing 13

Journal Entry of the Supreme Court of Ohio 14

Order of the Supreme Court of Ohio Sustaining Motion to Dismiss 15

Order of the Supreme Court of Ohio Overruling Motion for Leave to Appeal 15

Order of the Supreme Court of Ohio Denying Rehearing 16

B. Affidavit for Search Warrant 17

Search Warrant 18

C. Statutes 20

D. Excerpts From the Record 21

CITATIONS.

Cases.

Akron, City of, v. Williams, 175 O. S. 186 5

Go-Bart Importing Co., et al., v. United States, 282 U. S. 344 7

Henry v. United States, 361 U. S. 98, 102; 4 L. Ed. (2d) 134 8

Ker v. California, 374 U. S. 23 7

Mapp v. State of Ohio, 367 U. S. 643 ..... 4, 5

Nicholas v. City of Cleveland, 125 O. S. 474 5

State v. Lindway, 131 O. S. 166 5

Constitution and Statutes.

Constitution of the United States:

Amendment IV 1, 3

Amendment XIV 1, 3

Ohio Revised Code:

Section 2915.13 ..... 1, 2, 20

Section 2933.23 ..... 1, 3, 6, 20

Section 2933.24 ..... 1, 3, 20

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1963.

No. 564.

CARMEN TISONE,
Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Appellee.

MOTION AND BRIEF TO DISMISS APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

QUESTION PRESENTED.

Whether the Trial Court violated the constitutional rights of the Appellant as protected by the IV and XIV Amendments of the Constitution of the United States by failing to sustain a motion to suppress certain evidence which had been obtained as a result of a legally sufficient search warrant.

STATUTES INVOLVED.

Ohio Revised Code Section 2915.13, see Appendix C, page 20; Ohio Revised Code Section 2933.23, see Appendix C, page 20; Ohio Revised Code Section 2933.24, see Appendix C, page 20.

STATEMENT.

Appellant, Carmen Tisone, was indicted in Case No. 21773 by the Mahoning County, Ohio, Grand Jury for the Term of May, 1962. Appellant was charged with the violation of Ohio Revised Code Section 2915.13 (Promoting a Numbers Game).

The Appellant was arrested on August 2, 1962 by police officers of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, as a result of a search made at the Tisone Tavern, 1810 Wilson Avenue in the City of Youngstown, Ohio. The officers took this action pursuant to a search warrant issued by the Court of Common Pleas of Mahoning County, Ohio.

On March 18, 1963 this matter came on for trial before the Common Pleas Court and a Jury of twelve. Under date of March 19, 1963 the Jury returned a verdict of "Guilty as Charged." Prior to trial a motion was heard by the Trial Court relative to the suppression of the evidence obtained as a result of the search warrant. This motion was overruled by the Trial Court. The Trial Court sentenced the Appellant to a term of not less than one year nor more than ten years in the Ohio State Penitentiary. An appeal was perfected to the Court of Appeals, Seventh Judicial District. The Court of Appeals subsequently affirmed the verdict and judgment of the Court of Common Pleas. See Appendix A, page 13. The Supreme Court of Ohio upheld the conviction of the Appellant. See Appendix A, page 14.

ARGUMENT.

Appellant alleges that the Trial Court erred in overruling Appellant's motion to suppress the evidence obtained by virtue of a search warrant. Appellant has failed to establish any basis for this alleged claim of error on the part of the Trial Court. There is an allegation that the search warrant was not based upon a legally sufficient affidavit and, therefore, is in violation of the IV and XIV Amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America. The evidence in the case at bar not only fails to establish any illegal or unlawful proceedings by the Police Department in obtaining the search warrant but, on the contrary, clearly discloses that the police followed the statutory provisions of the State of Ohio in obtaining the search warrant in question.

See Appendix C, page 20, Ohio Revised Code Section 2933.23 and Ohio Revised Code Section 2933.24.

Clearly, Mr. Kovac (the affiant) was in possession of sufficient facts to cause him to believe that certain property that was described with particularity in the affidavit for the search warrant and the search warrant was concealed in the premises. The affiant had reason by virtue of the facts within his personal knowledge which would cause him to believe and form a belief sufficient to swear to the affidavit in question. The affidavit and the search warrant contained the following language:

> "* * * Such belief is based upon the facts that said premises were kept under surveillance by the undersigned for two afternoons, and a large number of people were observed frequenting said establishment and suspected of playing the numbers game and playing horse bets. * * *"

At the time the motion was heard relative to the suppression of evidence, Officer Kovac testified that the prem-

ises described as 1810 Wilson Avenue was kept under surveillance for two afternoons. Officer Kovac testified that the afternoons that he kept the premises under surveillance were August 1st and the 31st day of July, 1962. See Record, page 7, lines 23, 24, 25 and Record, page 8, lines 1 through 8. See Appendix D, pages 21 and 22.

> "Q. Now, officer, under this affidavit, you swore to it that you had observed these premises and kept them under surveillance for two afternoons. Now in relation to the date of August 2, 1962, when were these afternoons?
>
> A. Two days prior to the time we obtained the search warrant and affidavit.
>
> Q. That would be August 1 and the 31st day of July, 1962; am I correct?
>
> A. Yes, sir.
>
> Q. And what hours were those?
>
> A. Between 1:00 and 3:00 in the afternoon."

See also Record, page 8 where Officer Kovac continues to testify, lines 23, 24, 25 and Record, page 9, lines 1 through 25, and Record, page 10, lines 1 through 7. See Appendix D, pages 22-23.

Certainly, Mr. Kovac was in possession of sufficient facts within his own personal knowledge to cause him to form a belief that probable cause existed that Carmen Tisone was carrying on a gambling operation in the Tisone Tavern. The appellant places great reliance on the case of *Mapp vs. The State of Ohio*, 367 U. S. 643. This case is not in point. In the *Mapp* case it is doubtful that there was a search warrant. In the case at bar the officers were armed with a proper and legally sufficient search warrant. A reading of the Record will disclose this. Officer Andrew Kovac observed a large number of people entering the Tisone Tavern. He stopped a man who tore up a slip of paper and threw it on the wet pavement. Certainly he

had good reason to believe that gambling operations were being conducted on the premises known as Tisone's Tavern, 1810 Wilson Avenue, Youngstown, Ohio.

The State of Ohio is not here contesting *Mapp vs. Ohio*, 367 U. S. 643. The Supreme Court of Ohio in the recent case of *City of Akron vs. Williams*, 175 O. S. 186, held that the affidavit "must state the facts upon which such belief is based." In this case the affiant stated facts upon which his belief was based. The affidavit in the case at bar did not leave the determination whether there was probable cause for search to the judgment of the affiant.

Officer Andrew Kovac observed a large number of people entering the Tisone Tavern. He had kept the place under surveillance two days prior to obtaining the warrant. How can it be said that he did not have facts to form his belief? When this affidavit is examined it clearly will show that it is not subject to the disabilities the Court found in the case of *Nicholas vs. The City of Cleveland*, 125 O. S. 474. It is brought to this Court's attention that the affidavit for the search warrant in the case at bar meets the requirements of the law of Ohio as propounded by the Supreme Court of Ohio.

The State of Ohio, Appellee in this case, here and now state that they had a valid and subsisting search warrant. A review of the law of Ohio from *Nicholas vs. The City of Cleveland*, 125 O. S. 474 through *State vs. Lindway*, 131 O. S. 166 to *Mapp vs. Ohio*, 367 U. S. 643, and *City of Akron vs. Williams*, 175 O. S. 186, reveals that the affidavit and the search warrant in this case was legally sufficient. The affidavit and search warrant are based upon facts within the personal knowledge of the affiant and these facts are incorporated in the affidavit and the search warrant and are made a part of both instruments.

Defendant-Appellant alleges that the affidavit to obtain the search warrant was not filed prior to the issuing of the search warrant. This is simply not so. The affidavit to obtain the search warrant certainly was filed with the Court and Mr. Kovac did have a copy of the affidavit and the search warrant when he searched the premises in question. The affidavit and search warrant was filed with the Court of Common Pleas. In other words the Judge who issued the search warrant, in order that secrecy might be maintained, retained the affidavit and warrant in his files. If search warrants were not retained by the court when he issues the warrant and if they were filed in the Clerk's office prior to the search and spread upon the public record, this information would become general knowledge and the place to be searched would be tipped off by some enterprising citizen. See the testimony of William Machuga, Chief Deputy Clerk of Mahoning County, Ohio, Record, page 21, lines 21 through 25 and Record page 22, lines 1 through 15. See Appendix D.

See also Record page 26, lines 1 through 14. See Appendix D, pages 23-24.

Defendant-Appellant alleges that the affidavit to obtain the warrant was not filed in the Clerk's office until August 3, 1962, although the warrant was issued on August 2, 1962. There is no question but what there was no filing in the Clerk's office until August 3, 1962. The statutes of this state do not require that the affidavit to obtain a search warrant be filed in the Clerk's office prior to the issuance of the search warrant. Revised Code Section 2933.23 provides in part:

> "* * * a warrant for search shall not be issued until there is filed with the judge or magistrate an affidavit. * * *"

There is no requirement that the affidavit be filed with the Clerk. The affidavit must be filed with the judge or the magistrate as the case may be—and this was done. It is submitted that this claim of error is not well taken.

Appellant cites the recent case of *Ker vs. California*, 374 U. S. 23, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 10, 1963, as authority for the proposition that state courts must be guided by the federal court rules as to what constitutes probable cause. That case certainly does not hold that proposition whatsoever. *Ker vs. California* holds that the separate states:

> "are not precluded from developing workable rules governing arrest, search and seizures to meet the practical demands of effective criminal investigation and law enforcement in the states provided that those rules do not violate the constitutional proscription of unreasonable search and seizures and the concomitant command that evidence so seized against one who has standing to complain."
>
> "In the exercise of its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice in the Federal Courts, the Supreme Court has formulated rules of evidence to be applied in federal criminal prosecutions, but has established no assumption of supervisory authority over state courts. *Mapp vs. Ohio* implied no total obliteration of state laws relating to arrest and searches in favor of federal law."
>
> "There is no formula for the determination of reasonableness of a search, but each case must be decided on its own facts and circumstances."

Appellant relies on the case of *Go-Bart Importing Company, et al., vs. United States*, 282 U. S. 344. This case is not in point for the reason that reasonable grounds and probable cause do exist in the case at bar. United

States Supreme Court in the case of *Henry vs. United States,* 361 U. S. 98, 102; 4 L. Ed. (2d) 134, said:

> "Probable cause exists if the facts and circumstances known to the officer warrant a prudent man in believing that the offense has been committed."

A question of fact is presented in each case. The Youngstown police officer had good reason to believe that Tisone was regularly engaged in carrying on a scheme of chance involving policy tickets. See Record page 8 where Officer Kovac continues to testify, lines 23, 24, 25. Record page 9, lines 1 through 25; and Record page 10, lines 1 through 7, Appendix D, wherein the officer indicates that he had searched the premises in question on a prior occasion as a result of a prior search warrant. Mr. Kovac, the affiant, also indicated that on July 31st, 1962 he stopped a patron as he emerged from the tavern and the patron tore up a little slip and threw it on the ground.

CONCLUSION.

Appellee respectfully submits that the appeal should be dismissed on the grounds that it does not present a substantial Federal question for the reason stated. It is submitted that the judgment of the court below should be sustained.

CLYDE W. OSBORNE,
Prosecuting Attorney,
LOREN E. VAN BROCKLIN,
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney,
Court House, Mahoning County,
Youngstown, Ohio,
Counsel for the State of Ohio.

APPENDIX A.

OPINION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MAHONING COUNTY, OHIO.

(Dated: October 22, 1963.)

BROWN, P. J.

Defendant was found guilty by a jury and sentenced by the court for violating Revised Code Section 2915.13 (promoting a numbers game). Counsel for defendant maintains the court below must be reversed.

Defendant claims in his first assignment of error that Revised Code Section 2915.13 is unconstitutional in that it attempts to give the State of Ohio extra territorial police powers.

We hold that Revised Code Section 2915.13 does not violate any provision either of the Constitution of the State of Ohio or of the Constitution of the United States and that this assigned error is not well taken.

Defendant claims Revised Code Section 2915.13 is "unconstitutional because it is not definite and certain as to its meaning."

The act to which reference is here made is not uncertain in meaning. In fact, the words of the statute of which counsel for the defendant complains appear to have been inserted for the purpose of permitting particular words of local usage helpful in defining the exact "scheme of chance" to be inserted. The words or terms of similar import to "numbers game," "clearing house," or "policy" need only be such as will convey to a person of ordinary understanding and intelligence an adequate description of the prohibited act. *Wharton Criminal Law and Procedure* (1957), Volume 1, page 32, Section 18.

Defendant complains that the court erred in overruling appellant's motion to suppress evidence claimed to

have been obtained by unlawful search and seizure. Defendant cites *Mapp v. Ohio,* 367 U. S. 643.

This case is authority for the point that admission in state court of evidence obtained by illegal search and seizure is a violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. *Mapp v. Ohio* overruled *Wolf v. Colorado,* 338 U. S. 25, which had held that the so-called exclusionary rule applied to federal courts only.

In determining what constitutes an unreasonable search and seizure in violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, the significance of the *Mapp* case must be confined strictly to the aggravated facts of that case.

Mapp specifically states that it is for the trial court in the first instance to determine what constitutes a reasonable search and seizure and that in so doing the trial court may not follow any fixed formula. See also *State v. Young,* 91 Ohio Law Abstract 21.

In this case a warrant was issued upon an affidavit regular in form which contained the allegations required by Revised Code Section 2933.23. The facts stated therein or elicited by the court before issuing the warrant were such as to justify the trial court in issuing a search warrant.

The affidavit filed with the court for the purpose of obtaining the warrant stated the place to be searched and the property to be seized. It recited the belief that gambling paraphernalia, to-wit, numbers slips and horse bet slips were in the possession of the defendant, Carmen Tisone, and that the belief was based upon the fact that said premises were kept under surveillance by affiant, a police officer, and was based upon his observations during that period of time. Among these facts were statements

from which it could be gathered that the numbers of people who were frequenting the described premises during the period of observation, and the manner of their frequenting said establishment, was the basis of the belief of the affiant that there was probable cause for a warrant to issue.

In *State of Ohio v. Mapp*, 170 Ohio St. 427, the Supreme Court of Ohio assumed that the search and seizure was unlawful, so that court was not reversed by the United States Court upon this finding.

No federal case cited holds that state courts are required to follow rules or statutes followed by the federal courts in determining what is a reasonable and hence lawful search and seizure or the federal mechanics before obtaining a state court search warrant. If it were so held we would be extremely interested in the rationale.

The search in this case was reasonable and in all respects lawful, no right of privacy was unlawfully invaded. Due process was carefully observed. The police officers involved should be commended for diligence. The motion to suppress was properly overruled.

The fourth assigned error involves the trial court's refusal to instruct that mere possession of numbers slips by the defendant would not be a crime under Revised Code Section 2915.13. Under the evidence in the case such a charge was properly refused.

The record does not bear out the errors assigned as fifth and sixth, and they are overruled.

Approved:

PAUL W. BROWN,
Judge.

FRANCE, J., Concurs.

JONES, J., Concurs.

JOURNAL ENTRY OF THE COURT OF APPEALS.

(Filed October 23, 1963.)

This cause came on for hearing upon the appeal on questions of law, assignments of error, bill of exceptions, the transcript, and the original papers and pleadings from the Court of Common Pleas of Mahoning County, Ohio, and was argued by counsel, the Court examined all of the claims of error, on consideration whereof the Court finds there is no error apparent on the record in said proceedings and judgment prejudicial to the Appellant.

It is, therefore, considered by the Court that the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

It is further ordered that a special mandate be sent to the Common Pleas Court of Mahoning County, Ohio, directing the Court of Common Pleas to carry this judgment into execution. To all of which, Appellant, by his counsel, excepts.

JOURNAL ENTRY OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OVERRULING MOTION FOR REHEARING.

This cause came on for hearing upon the motion for rehearing and the brief in support thereof filed by Defendant-Appellant. Upon consideration whereof the Court finds that the motion is not well taken and is hereby overruled.

JOURNAL ENTRY OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

(March 25, 1964.)

This cause, here on appeal as of right from the Court of Appeals for Mahoning County was heard in the manner prescribed by law and upon motion of the appellee to dismiss such appeal.

On consideration thereof, such appeal is dismissed for the reason that no substantial constitutional question exists herein.

It is further ordered that the plaintiff-appellee recover from the defendant-appellant its costs herein expended; that a mandate be sent to the Court of Common Pleas carry this judgment into execution; and that a copy of this entry be certified to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for Mahoning County for entry.

I, Thomas L. Startzman, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio, certify that the foregoing entry was correctly copied from the Journal of this Court. Journal 46, Page 319.

Witness my hand and the seal of the Court this 23rd day of September, 1964.

THOMAS L. STARTZMAN, *Clerk*,
By NORMAN P. MEYERS, *Deputy*.

(Seal)

ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO SUSTAINING MOTION TO DISMISS.

MOTION BY APPELLEE TO DISMISS APPEAL AS OF RIGHT.

(March 25, 1964.)

It is ordered by the Court that this motion is sustained.

I, Thomas L. Startzman, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing entry was correctly copied from the records of said Court, to-wit, from Journal No. 46, Page 317.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court this 23rd day of September, 1964.

THOMAS L. STARTZMAN, *Clerk*.
By NORMAN P. MEYERS, *Deputy*.

(Seal)

ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO OVERRULING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL.

(March 25, 1964.)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MAHONING COUNTY.

It is ordered by the Court that this motion is overruled.

Costs:

Motion Fee, $20,00, paid by Avetis G. Darvanan.

(Clerk's certificate omitted.)

ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO DENYING REHEARING.

(April 29, 1964.)

It is ordered by the Court that rehearing in this case is denied.

It is further ordered that issuance of the mandate in this case be, and the same hereby is, stayed for a period of seven (7) days from this date to enable appellant to apply to the Supreme Court of the United States for a stay of execution.

/s/ KINGSLEY TAFT,

KINGSLEY TAFT, *Chief Justice.*

(Clerk's certificate omitted.)

APPENDIX B.

AFFIDAVIT FOR SEARCH WARRANT.

THE STATE OF OHIO, MAHONING COUNTY.

Before me, John W. Ford, Judge of the Common Pleas Court in and for the above named County, personally came Patrolman Andrew Kovac, who being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he believes, and has good cause to believe that the following articles, to-wit:

Gambling Paraphernalia, to-wit:—
Numbers slips and Horse Bet Slips

(1) kept and used for unlawful gaming, etc. are at the present time kept and concealed in said County of Mahoning and that the said articles, or some part thereof, are in the possession and under the control of Carmen Tisone at (2) 1810 Wilson Ave., Youngstown, Ohio, a three (3) story brick building with glass front. And that said Carmen Tisone and the above named articles should be seized.

Such belief is based upon the fact that

said premises were kept under surveillance by the undersigned for two afternoons, and a large number of people were observed frequenting said establishment and suspected of playing the numbers game and placing horse bets.

/s/ ANDREW KOVAC.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 2nd day of August, 1962.

/s/ JOHN W. FORD,
Judge.

SEARCH WARRANT.

THE STATE OF OHIO, MAHONING COUNTY.

To the Chief of Police, Youngstown, Ohio:

Whereas there has been filed with me an affidavit, of which the following is a true copy, to-wit:

The State of Ohio, Mahoning County.

Before me John W. Ford, Judge of the Common Pleas Court in and for the above named County, personally came Patrolman Andrew Kovac, who being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he believes, and has good cause to believe that the following articles, to-wit:

Gambling Paraphernalia, to-wit:—
Numbers Slips and Horse Bet Slips

are at the present time kept and concealed in said County of Mahoning and that the said articles, or some part thereof, are in the possession and under the control of Carmen Tisone at 1810 Wilson Ave., Youngstown, Ohio, a three (3) story brick building with glass front, and that said Carmen Tisone and the above named articles should be seized.

Such belief is based upon the fact that

said premises were kept under surveillance by the undersigned for two afternoons, and a large number of people were observed frequenting said establishment and suspected of playing the numbers game and placing horse bets.

/s/ ANDREW KOVAC.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 2nd day of August, 19 .

/s/ JOHN W. FORD,
Judge.

These are, therefore, to command you in the name of the State of Ohio, with the necessary and proper assistance, to enter, in the day time, into 1810 Wilson Avenue, Youngstown, Ohio, a three (3) story brick building with a glass front of the said City of Youngstown in the County aforesaid, and there diligently search for the said goods and chattels, or articles, to-wit:

Gambling Paraphernalia, to-wit:—
Numbers Slips and Horse Bet Slips

and that you bring the same or any part thereof, found on such search, and also the body of Carmen Tisone, forthwith before me, or some other Judge or Magistrate of the County having cognizance thereof, to be disposed of and dealt with according to law.

Given under my hand, this 2nd day of August, 1962.

/s/ JOHN W. FORD,
Judge.

Return of Chief of Police. Youngstown, Ohio.

The State of Ohio, _____ County.

Received this writ August 2, 1962, at 10:00 o'clock A. M., and entered 1810 Wilson Ave. at 2:30 P. M. date, and confiscated off of the person of Carmen Tisone, 25 slips with numbers on them, 7 white slips with horse bets on same, 2 white slips with horse bets and numbers on same, 2 white pads.

/s/ ANDREW KOVAC,
/s/ THOMAS E. DEWITT.

APPENDIX C.

STATUTES.

OHIO REVISED CODE SECTION 2915.13—Promoting A "Numbers Game."

"No person shall establish, open, set on foot, carry on, promote, make, draw, or act as "backer" or "vendor" for or on account of a scheme of chance known as "policy," "numbers game," "clearing house," or by words or terms of similar import, located in or to be drawn, paid, or carried on within or without this state, or by any of such means sell or expose for sale anything of value.

Whoever violates this section shall be fined not less than five hundred nor more than one thousand dollars and imprisoned not less than one nor more than ten years."

OHIO REVISED CODE SECTION 2933.23—Affidavit for Search Warrant.

"A warrant for search shall not be issued until there is filed with the judge or magistrate an affidavit particularly describing the house or place to be searched, the person to be seized, the things to be searched for and seized, and alleging substantially the offense in relation thereto, and that the complainant believes and has good cause to believe that such things are there concealed, and he shall state the facts upon which such belief is based. The judge or magistrate may demand other and further evidence before issuing such warrant."

OHIO REVISED CODE SECTION 2933.24—What Search Warrants Shall Contain.

"A warrant for search shall be directed to the proper officer, and, by a copy of the affidavit inserted therein or annexed and referred to, shall show or recite all the mate-

rial facts alleged in the affidavit, and particularly describe the things to be searched for, the house or place to be searched, and the person to be seized. Such warrant shall command the officer to search such house or place for the property or other things, and to bring them, together with the person to be seized, before the judge or magistrate. The command of the warrant shall be that the search be made in the daytime, unless there is urgent necessity for a search in the night in which case a search in the night may be ordered. Such search warrant shall be returned by the officer holding the same not later than three days after issuance."

APPENDIX D.

EXCERPTS FROM THE RECORD.

Officer Kovac testified the afternoons that he kept the premises under surveillance were August 1st and July 31st, 1962. See Record page 7, lines 23, 24, 25 and Record page 8, lines 1 through 8.

> "Q. Now, officer, under this affidavit, you swore to it that you had observed these premises and kept them under surveillance for two afternoons. Now in relation to the date of August 2, 1962, when were these afternoons?
>
> A. Two days prior to the time we obtained the search warrant and affidavit.
>
> Q. That would be August 1 and the 31st day of July, 1962; am I correct?
>
> A. Yes, sir.
>
> Q. And what hours were those?
>
> A. Between 1:00 and 3:00 in the afternoon."

See also Record page 8 where Officer Kovac continues testify, lines 23, 24, 25 and Record page 9, lines 1 rough 25, and Record page 10, lines 1 through 7.

"Q. Did you stop anybody leaving this tavern at any time?

A. A couple of them we stopped.

Q. For what purpose?

A. We stopped them on South Center Street and asked them what they were doing in there. They said they went in to see a guy. I say: Who? They says: Carmen.

Q. Now, officer, you testified that you signed here and swore to it that a large number of people were observed frequenting said establishment and suspected of playing the numbers game and placing horse bets. Are you referring to July 31, 1962 and August 1, 1962?

A. And prior to that.

Q. Because we had another search warrant issued from the Municipal Court.

Q. How long was that?

A. About two, three months before that.

Q. And is that the one Judge Joyce gave you?

A. I think it is.

Q. Did you search this place pursuant to the warrant Judge Joyce gave you?

A. We did.

Q. Did you find anything?

A. Not at that time.

Q. Now, on July 31, 1962, outside of observing a large number of men going into this tavern, did you observe anything connected with the numbers business that day, those two days?

A. Those two days prior when we stopped those fellows that came out of there and stopped them on South Center Street?

Q. Yes.

A. We asked them—one of them had tore up a little slip and threw it on the floor just before we stopped him.

Q. What did the other one do?

A. The other one we stopped, he said he went in to see Carmen."

See the testimony of William Machuga, Chief Deputy Clerk of Mahoning County, Ohio, Record page 21, lines 21 through 25 and Record page 22, lines 1 through 15:

"A. They don't appear in the Court's half sheet. Entries of the issuance of the search warrant do not appear on the Court's half sheet.

Q. Are there any other cases in your office under which search warrants are issued where the entries are kept?

A. No; the only—well, apparently in connection with these there are no entries made. That is journal entries.

Q. What do you mean with these, search warrants?

A. The first time these come to our attention is when they are brought in to our office already executed, and at which time they are posted on the appearance docket.

Q. The Court makes no entry on any affidavit or search warrant as to date of filing in its half sheet?

A. Ordinarily I would say not. I don't recall of any where it's been done.

Q. When is the first time you receive these affidavits and search warrants?

A. Well, when they—either I suppose the officer executing it or the prosecutor's office would bring them down to us.

Q. After they have been served or returned?"

See also Record page 26, lines 1 through 14.

Mr. Darvanan: "That is all."

MICRO C

TRADE MA

PC 68

CARD 22
ARK ®
MATTHEW BENDER & COMPANY
MB
69-5
m
microcard

CROSS EXAMINATION by Mr. Van Brocklin.

"Q. Mr. Machuga, you are the Chief Deputy Clerk of Courts, aren't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in the course of your official capacity you have had occasions to see officers and members of the prosecutor's staff come in with affidavits for search warrants and search warrants that have been signed by judges and the seal put on the respective papers and not left in your office; is that correct?

A. I think on occasions I have seen that done."